

914.3
Day/For
86245



00086245



00086245

Digitized with financial assistance from
Shri Brihad Bhartiya Samaj
on 20 February, 2020

FORTY-FOUR MONTHS IN GERMANY AND TURKEY

FEBRUARY 1915 TO OCTOBER 1918

A RECORD OF PERSONAL IMPRESSIONS

BY
HAR DAYAL, M.A.

86245
a2

LONDON
P. S. KING & SON, LTD.
ORCHARD HOUSE, WESTMINSTER

1920

PREFACE

THE author of the following pages has been well known for the last ten years as one of the most active leaders of the Indian revolutionary party.* Born of a Kayasth family in Delhi in 1884, he was educated in St. Stephen's College, until he took the B.A. degree of the Punjab University and was awarded a scholarship tenable in the Government College, Lahore. In 1904 he stood first in the list of the successful candidates for the M.A. degree in English literature, and on the recommendation of the Punjab University was given a State scholarship of £200 a year by the Government of India. He entered St. John's College, Oxford, in 1905, and began to read for the Honours School of Modern History, but in 1907 resigned his Government scholarship and removed his name from the college books. He associated himself with Shyamji Krishnavarma, who was at that time the recognised leader of the Indian revolutionary movement, and in his journal, *The Indian Sociologist* (October, 1907), stated that Har Dayal had resigned his scholarship, "as he holds that no Indian who really loves his country ought to compromise his principles and barter his rectitude of conduct for any favour whatever at the hands of the alien oppressive rulers of India."

* Further details of the history of this movement may be found in the *Report of the East India Sedition Committee*, 1918, especially paras. 130 and 132: price 9d.

After a visit to India, where he spread the doctrine of active hostility to the British Government, Har Dayal in 1908 rejoined Shyamji Krishnavarma in Paris, but finding him unwilling to adopt violent methods in the furtherance of political ends, he determined to transfer the centre of his activities to America, and in 1911 settled in San Francisco. Here he published in several Indian languages a newspaper called *Ghadr* ("Mutiny"), in which he advocated murder and revolution, the formation of secret societies, and the adoption of every possible means of violence for the expulsion of the British from India. He also addressed meetings in various towns in America in support of the Indian revolutionary movement, until in March, 1914, he was arrested by the authorities of the United States Government, with a view to his deportation as an undesirable alien. Released on bail, he escaped to Switzerland, and after the war broke out, joined the Indian National Party, which worked in Berlin under the directions of the German Foreign Office. In the following pages he has described his experiences and the reasons that have led him to change his attitude towards British rule in India.

CONTENTS

SECTION	PAGE
I. GENERAL IMPRESSIONS . . .	I
II. IN CONSTANTINOPLE . . .	29
III. "ASIA MINOR" IN BERLIN . . .	55
IV. THE GERMANS IN ASIA . . .	78
CONCLUSION	97

FORTY-FOUR MONTHS IN GERMANY AND TURKEY

SECTION I

GENERAL IMPRESSIONS

“A mad world, my masters.”

Shakespeare.

It is not easy to discuss within the limits of a short essay the salient characteristics of German society as it presented itself to an Oriental traveller during the war. I have spent about three and a half years in Germany and Turkey during the war ; and I now jot down my personal impressions for the benefit of the people of India and Egypt. I speak from direct personal experience. I shall not quote from books and newspapers. I relate what I have seen with my own eyes and heard with my own ears. The history of Germany during the last forty-eight years has been a record of folly

ending in failure ; and this war has been a German crime ending in a German catastrophe. My personal views and reflections may be useful to the educated classes of India, Egypt, and other Oriental countries.

Oriental readers may ask how it was possible that such an active and well-instructed nation should have made the mistakes and committed the sins which have brought a just Nemesis on it. I shall try to answer this question, extenuating nothing and setting down naught in malice. I am a cosmopolitan in spirit, and can judge and criticise with an unbiassed mind.

The Germans are intellectually not behind the other European nations, but they are morally, socially, and politically in a lower stage of development. They are a well-instructed, semi-barbarous nation, and resemble a Berber or a Kurd, who should somehow acquire a knowledge of advanced science and literature without thereby divesting himself of his primitive habits and ideas. In Germany one finds a strange and startling mixture of rampant mediæval barbarism and up-to-date modern civilisa-

tion. Intellectually the Germans belong to the twentieth century. Morally, socially and politically they are still in the Middle Ages. That is the reason why they are despised and hated by all foreigners, and why they must suffer for their numerous sins of omission and commission. Purged and purified, they can rise to the level of contemporary civilisation, for progress is the law of social evolution everywhere. The Germans to-day have nothing to give to the world except their books and their inventions ; but they must learn a great deal from England, France, Italy, and America before they can call themselves a civilised people.

The most noticeable feature of German society as a whole is the spirit of excessive megalomania that pervades it. This atmosphere poisons the whole life of the nation. The Germans believe that they are the greatest, wisest, bravest, ablest, noblest and best people on earth. They not only believe it but also say so, and proclaim it in their writings and discourses. As a corollary they despise all other peoples as incapable

and worthless. Even a noted scientist like Professor Oswald speaks of the Germans as the "chosen people" ("das auserwählte Volk"). Of course, he cannot tell by whom and for what this people has been "chosen"; but such is the childish vanity of this well-instructed nation. I remember reading this sentence in a book about the future of Germany: "We are the best-educated and the bravest nation in the world." I need not quote from the rabid effusions of the Pan-Germans, with which we are now sufficiently familiar.

I was at first at a loss how to explain that strange declaration of the King of Bavaria at the beginning of the war: "We shall win, whatever may be the number of enemies"! But I found that every German, high and low, rich and poor, suffers from this curious mental derangement. It is not easy to understand how this psychological condition has arisen. The Germans have no reason to have such a high opinion of themselves. They have not achieved more than the other civilised nations of the world. Their position does not warrant such absurd

pride and self-esteem. They have not been the pioneers of human civilisation, like the Egyptians or the Chinese. They have not promulgated great religions, like the Jews, the Arabs, and the Hindus. They have not created the noblest art, philosophy and literature, like the Greeks. They have not discovered and colonised vast continents, like the Spaniards. They have not led the way in founding democratic institutions, like the English and the French. They have not organised wonderful empires, like the English and the Romans. They are not the creators of modern art and literature, like the Italians. The Germans have also contributed their quota to human culture, but they have not done more than other nations. They cannot even claim to be the first among equals. In fact, they have accomplished less than other ancient and modern nations, though it is of course impossible to compare such different culture-values as Buddhism, Greek sculpture, Beethoven, Shakespeare, and the American Declaration of Independence. The world to-day bears the impress of Rome, Greece, India, Spain,

France, and England; but the German language practically is not known beyond the frontiers of Germany and Austria. England has organised a vast system of government in Asia and Africa for the ultimate benefit of backward tribes and races. French is the second language of the educated classes in all countries. Italy has given us Dante and the great artists of the Renaissance. But Germany's achievements have been more modest, and cannot be said to have conquered the world. Why are the Germans, then, so vain and silly? Why do they lack "self-knowledge," which is the foundation of true virtue in man? I have been able to discover only one cause of this distemper; it is the delirium of the *parvenu*, the arrogance of the upstart, the self-importance of the *nouveau riche*, the intoxication of an American "potato-king." The Germans have been spoiled and ruined by their success in the war of 1870-1. They had been accustomed only to defeat and disaster for a long time. They had been beaten on many battlefields in their own country. Their history had been a miserable

record of disunion, inefficiency and humiliation. But the war of 1870-1 suddenly wrought a change in their fortunes. They defeated the leading nation of Europe and had their fill of vengeance against the ancestral foe. They established a powerful national State, which they had never been able to do since the days of Charlemagne. They thus emerged from age-long obscurity and feebleness and became a force in world-politics. Their success has "turned their heads," for who can bear prosperity well? It has blinded them to the facts and realities of the life of the world. It has filled their shallow minds with the fumes and vapours of puerile pride and reckless ambition. It has warped their moral sense and hardened their hearts in sin. It has been their curse during the last forty-eight years. This poison has permeated every nerve and fibre of the social system, and can be eliminated only through suffering and expiation.

As a consequence of this megalomania, the Germans have been further demoralised by their new cult of Force. They have now unlimited faith in brute Force. They

believe only in Might, and idolise the soldier and the military officer. The nation which was noted for its idealism a hundred years ago has fallen so low that it can understand only the law of the mailed fist. It is one of the saddest tragedies in the social history of the world. The war of 1870-1 has resulted in the moral suicide of a whole people. At present the Germans are hopelessly materialistic in this respect. They know that they won the victories of 1870-1 and proclaimed the new German Empire at Versailles because they were superior to the French in force. They believe that they owe their present security and prosperity to Moltke, and not to Goethe and Kant. They have learned that Force alone can protect a nation against its enemies. This experience has led them to exaggerate the virtue of Force as a necessary factor in evolution in the present imperfect condition of human society. They have learned a great truth, but they have so distorted and misinterpreted it that it has become a venomous lie in their hands. They have glorified Force and offered incense to this

new god, which has rescued them from their Egyptian bondage of past centuries. They have jumped from one extreme to another, as they have forgotten that virtue lies in the mean. They have at last come to know the use of Force, but they are also eager to proceed to its abuse. I was talking at an evening party to Graf X——, and explaining to him the importance of securing the goodwill of the Oriental nations for the German cause, when he suddenly said (in English) : “ We must hack our way through.” A Persian gentleman assured a German diplomat that the Persian people sympathised with Germany ! but the latter replied : “ Two machine-guns would be more useful than sympathy ” ! A German journalist said to me : “ Everything in this country turns round war and ‘ soldiering. ’ ” The most favourite toy for German children during the war was the “ dicke Bertha ” (“ fat Bertha ”), as the 42-centimetre gun employed by the Germans at the siege of Antwerp was christened. Models of this gun were bought and kept by German families with great piety, like the figure of a tutelary goddess.

All Germany seemed to accept it as the greatest emblem of virtue and glory. In Germany the universal faith in Force obtrudes itself on the attention of a foreigner at every step. This war must now teach the Germans that those who take up the sword shall perish by the sword.

The cult of Force has naturally led to dreams of world-conquest. The Germans had developed such excessive political ambition before this war that they aimed at nothing more or less than a "Weltreich." Megalomania and the faith in Force must breed such monstrous progeny. The Germans believed that they could easily defeat England, France, Russia, and the whole world put together. A German official said to me: "What can America do to us?" The remark convinced me that this nation was doomed, as blindness and vanity could not go further. As the German regards all other nations with utter contempt, he draws the necessary conclusion that he must rule over them. A German gentleman, whom I met in a boarding-house in Wiesbaden, said: "We must either win a world-empire, or

perish." I said *to myself*: "The latter alternative is certainly preferable." A German lady, who was more modest than the majority of her countrymen, said: "We must not think that we can defeat England. If we make peace with England, Germany and England can dominate the whole world between them." A Spanish student, who was present, said: "That would be very sad for the whole world, I think." The Germans actually believed that they would crush all their enemies within three months, and celebrate the Christmas of 1914 at home as undisputed masters of Europe! This is not a joke, but a real fact of German life, however incredible it may seem to all of us. As the war dragged on, and the pinch of hunger began to be felt, I heard this plaint very often: "We thought that the war would last only three months, or, at the most, half a year. But it has turned out otherwise." In contrast to such fatal folly, which was due to sheer megalomania, we may remember Lord Kitchener's forecast that the war would last three years, though the Germans laughed at this prophecy at the

time. The English knew that they would win the war in the end, but they did not underrate their adversaries, as they had a closer grasp of realities and a better knowledge of the world-situation. The Germans really "ran amok," for they went forth to fight in a fit of madness. During my sojourn in Germany I saw that the whole country was a political Bedlam, and nothing more. I found no trace of wisdom, insight or sound judgment anywhere.

It is a wrong idea that only a certain class or a few statesmen entertained such wild schemes. The Prussian Junker was the first to covet his neighbour's goods, but now the whole nation is infected with such fatuous ambition. I listened to a discussion on the Belgian question in a village public-house near Wiesbaden in January, 1917. The general opinion seemed to be summed up at the end by a middle-aged farmer in these words (spoken in dialect): "Well, if we give up Belgium, all this blood has been shed in vain." A learned professor, who is loved and respected by all his friends for his noble character, said in the spring of 1918:

“ If this great offensive succeeds, there must be no more talk of evacuating Belgium. All that must be kept. It was part of the old German Empire.” A German general, whom I met in a sanatorium in the autumn of 1917, delivered a speech on Hindenburg’s birthday, and said: “ Belgium is a holy land to us now, as it has been watered by the blood of thousands of our heroic sons. It is foolish to talk of giving it up.” These opinions, uttered at wide intervals by representatives of different classes of society, proved to me that German imperialism really menaced Europe with servitude, and converted me to President Wilson’s view of the aims and designs of the German Government. But I saw that the whole nation was to blame, and not merely the Government, which executed the will of the people. The German press was unanimous in its approval of the policy of the Government; and even the Socialists voted all the war credits up to the last moment. The Germans clung to their delusions with desperate tenacity till the final catastrophe came. In the summer of 1918 a Berlin

professor wrote to a colleague that the people were following with keen anxiety the course of the offensive on the Western front, from which they all hoped for "final victory and a *German* peace" ("endgültigen Sieg und den deutschen Frieden"). The peculiar phrase, "a German peace," meant that Germany should keep all that she had conquered since August, 1914. This was the cherished aim of all Germans, without distinction of class or party, throughout the war. I know that it was so, whatever the hypocritical politicians may have said in their public speeches.

The Germans think that they are really so superior to other nations that they may regard themselves as beings of a different order altogether. They are the real Men; all others are specimens for zoological museums. They deny the existence of a common bond of humanity between themselves and other peoples, as the gulf between them and the rest of mankind cannot be bridged by such superficial characteristics as an erect posture and other peculiarities of human anatomy. A morbid sense of racial

superiority can deaden our finer feelings and blunt our sympathy with our fellow-men.

Some Americans defended slavery on the ground that the negroes really belonged to a different species, and could therefore be treated like animals. The Germans look upon all other nations, European and Oriental, in much the same way. They fancy that they are as superior to the other European nations as these latter are above the semi-civilised Asiatics in the scale of civilisation. As a consequence of this strange aberration the Germans hold themselves bound by no law of humanity in their dealings with other nations. They do not observe the rules and practices enjoined by "international law," for this law has been made by creatures who are no better than animals. The lords of creation are not to be controlled by such irrelevant enactments ! The Germans have committed the atrocities which have exposed them to the wrath of the entire world because they have learned to despise all men as brutes. This explanation at least deserves careful consideration. They are cruel and brutal towards the con-

quered, as we are cruel to animals, which we slaughter without remorse or compunction for our advantage. They violate the honour of respectable ladies in occupied territory because they look upon all non-German women only as females. They burn and devastate like the Huns and the Mongols because they have no pity for the sufferings of others. A German lady bewailed the hard lot of her countrymen in the regions now occupied by the armies of the *Entente*. A friend remarked : " But the German officers have been quartered on the people of Belgium and France during four years." Thé lady replied : " Well, a German officer, that is a different thing altogether."

A Persian gentleman said to a German lady in Berlin : " I am deeply touched at the sight of the wounded soldiers. Can I do something for them ? " She said : " Why do you feel for them ? You are not a German." This remark reveals the depths of moral insensibility to which the Germans have sunk during the last fifty years. Even a woman could not understand why a foreigner pitied wounded German soldiers !

I am sure that this typical German woman was incapable of feeling or showing any sympathy for sick and wounded English, French or Italian soldiers. She could judge the Persian gentleman only by the moral standards in which she herself was trained. I am not inditing a libel on the German people when I assert that they regard all non-Germans as sub-human creatures. I myself was loth to believe it at first, but I was compelled to bow to the logic of facts. We think that the Germans are men ; but they don't think that we are men. It is desirable and necessary that all Europeans, Americans, Asiatics and Africans should know this fact.

It would not be out of place to mention at this point that I am opposed to German colonisation in Africa and Asia even on a small scale. The Germans are morally unfit to administer colonies, because they do not recognise our common human nature at all. In the colonies the Europeans are absolute masters of the native population. They have weapons, organisation and scientific knowledge, and their will is law. The abuse

of their giant strength is fraught with the most terrible consequences to the poor aborigines, who are like children or sheep in the hands of men wielding irresistible power. There is no champion of the natives but the moral law in the soul of the European rulers and settlers. The weak and helpless Africans can only say : " We, too, are men, brothers, and Christians." This appeal is their only refuge. The European settler can do good to the natives only in so far as he obeys his own moral code. The moral standards of the colonising nation determine the fate of the inferior race. For this reason the Germans must not be allowed to rule over the primitive tribes of Africa or Asia, for they can manage a colony only as a meat-packing company manages its cattle farms. When they treat European peoples like the Belgians and the French in this spirit, how would they behave towards the Herreros and other African tribes, with which they have nothing in common ? Colonisation is a sad affair, even under the best circumstances. There is much cruelty, exploitation, suffering and injustice in all

colonies. But a German colony would certainly be a dreadful inferno. There is no more diabolical ogre than a German *in power*. The German is utterly unfit to be entrusted with power over weaker fellow-men. The English, French, American and Italian colonists also make mistakes, and are often guilty of injustice ; but they recognise the law of humanity and can never transgress certain well-defined limits. A Swedish gentleman, who has spent twenty years in Algeria, said to me : “ Les Français sont très humains ” (“ The French are very humane people ”). The English are known all the world over to be “ gentlemen.” The Americans bear with their negro fellow-citizens, and even work for their advancement. In all English, French, American and Italian colonies the civil rights of the population and the elementary laws of morality are scrupulously respected by the white rulers. But such would not be the case in a German colony, as the German does not believe that non-Germans or animals have any “ rights ” or “ moral laws.” So long as the German nation has this psychology it must not

receive a mandate to administer a colony. If the Germans think we are animals, we think they are fiends. So we are quits, at least for the present.

Imperialism has begotten many vices in the German character, but avarice is the ruling passion of the German's soul. Gold is his god in public and private life. In this respect the aims of the State coincide with the tendencies of the individual citizen. All Germans are mad in the pursuit of wealth. They are all in a hurry to amass a fortune. I think that this trait explains why the Germans are unpopular in other countries. All men, everywhere, wish to earn money, and it is a duty to work honestly for economic gain. But the Germans are very mean, avaricious, stingy, unscrupulous and selfish. Every foreigner is struck with this characteristic of all Germans without distinction of class. Stones may yield oil, but no generous action can be expected from a German. If he can save a shilling by sponging on others or abusing their confidence, he will surely do so. He has the very disgusting habit of enjoying hospitality without thinking of

returning it. He is very willing to eat your cakes, but he cannot waste his own cakes on you. I made the acquaintance of a distinguished German scholar, whom I also agreed to help in his literary work. I presented him with two boxes of good cigars, and tried to win his friendly sympathy in other ways. I used to visit him almost every afternoon. He never offered me a cup of tea, though he had received my gifts and was always very affable and talkative. I noticed that he had his afternoon tea just before I called. It never occurred to him that he should at least once or twice ask me to drink a cup of tea with him. He did not consider it safe even to mention it, as the experiment was too risky. Supposing I had actually accepted the invitation! It would have meant an economic catastrophe for him. Some German politicians visited Constantinople and invited a few Turkish politicians to see them. It is reported that they did not offer even a cup of coffee to the Turkish colleagues because, of course, a cup of coffee costs a penny, and the German cannot make such a sacrifice. Such melan-

choly meanness throws some light on the real character of the average German. A Swedish journalist related how the German guests at a party took away all the cigars. I have forgotten the details of the story, but he ended with these words: "An Englishman never does this sort of thing." The Germans have really a genius for petty selfishness of this kind. It is impossible for a German to make friends. He is an anti-social, egotistic and unlovable creature. At present he is interested chiefly in money. A German gentleman said to me: "This time France must pay us an indemnity of 45 milliards. We took too little in 1871." I mentioned to a professor of philosophy the news that the Bolshevik Government had delivered to the German officials the first instalments of the indemnity in gold bars. He asked me to read the newspaper to him, and said: "What does it say? Have the gold bars been actually delivered?" I replied: "Yes. They have been deposited in the Reichsbank." The exponent of philosophy gave a grunt of satisfaction at this news, and I could see that he was trying

to visualise the glittering bars of gold which Germany had gained as booty. Avarice has corroded the soul of this nation and made it unfit for the common offices of courtesy and friendship. I don't know how it can be cured of this vice.

While the Germans threaten the whole world with conquest and "Kultur," their social and political institutions at home are of the mediæval and reactionary type. Slaves are proper instruments for enslaving others. Despotism, bureaucracy and caste are the foundations of German society. When I was there the air reeked with servility and snobbery. Those who had lived in England, France, America or Switzerland found life in Germany altogether insupportable. The worship of the Kaiser was the creed of half Germany. Fulsome flattery of the monarch was considered a mark of patriotism, and reminded me of the age of the Tudors. The bust of the Kaiser was a pestilential nuisance in Berlin. It was crowned with wreaths and flowers in the big concert house in Mauerstrasse, like the statue of a heathen god. I entered a chemist's

shop, and there it was on the shelf, with its repellent expression of insolent braggadocio. Go where you would you could not escape this ubiquitous bust. The royal family was also on sale in pictures and cards of all sorts. The Empress, the Crown Prince, his children, their cousins, their nurses and the relatives of the nurses were all very much in evidence in the bookshops and at the street corners. The whole show was very disgusting and ludicrous. But it was an important social institution of Germany. Let us hope that the Germans have now got rid of the Hohenzollerns for ever. The monarchy may be abolished, but German society cannot be freed so easily from bureaucracy and the spirit of caste. In Germany everything is done for the people, and nothing by the people. As there are no democratic institutions, the functionaries fear no control or criticism. They meddle with everything, and plague the people in a thousand different ways. All Germans who have lived for some time in England or America refuse to return to their native land. They have breathed the free atmosphere of English and

American society, and detest the bureaucratic system of Germany. I met a German merchant who had lived for more than ten years in England. We were at the dinner table in a sanatorium at Partenkirchen, in Bavaria. The talk turned on the merits and demerits of the English people. A patriotic German lady said : " The French are our old enemies. But why have the English joined them ? They are a gang of robbers." I remained silent. The merchant replied : " But England has much better political institutions. There, in London, I am I " (" Ich bin ich "), " but here. . . ." At this point he put both his hands on his ears as the most effective method of expressing what he meant. That phrase, " Ich bin ich," sums up centuries of English history. It is curious that the uneducated merchant could find no other words to pay his tribute of praise for English freedom. In the summer of 1917 a lady wrote to me from Berlin : " All our rights are being taken away. It is a miserable time here." The Junker class had established a reign of terror in order to stifle adverse criticism. Many Liberals and

Socialists were in "Schutzhaft" during the war. The Germans seemed to be quite unconscious of their slavery. They had known only this system in their lives. A German journalist said to me: "What do you mean by talking of free America? We have as much freedom here as the Americans." I tried to explain to him the difference between German and American institutions; but he did not see the point. Another German friend said: "You must be born a German in order to understand our system." I thanked my stars that I was not born a German. Germany is several centuries behind the other European countries in social evolution. This war is perhaps the beginning of the end of the old system.

The spirit of caste is more prevalent in German society than in other countries. Every man must have his "Titel," which is always prefixed to his name. It would be very impolite to omit the "Titel" in writing or speaking to a person. Thus it often happens that a man's name is never heard in conversation. He is always "Herr Pro-

fessor," or "Herr Postdirektor," or "Herr Geheimrat," or even "Herr Baumeister." The mania for a "Titel" goes so far that some people coin curious titles indicating their social position, like "Herr Brauerei-Besitzer" ("Mr. Brewery-Owner"). The enormous number of "Rats" of different species in German society spread the plague of snobbery and servility. Thus there are Geheimrats, Kommerzienrats, Hofrats, etc., etc. A woman will put the husband's title before her name, and call herself "Hofratsgattin" (a Hofrat's wife). One comes across such names as "Lawyer's-widow Mrs. Meyer." A lady chose to call herself "Baron's-mother-in-law Mrs. So-and-So." The spirit of caste leads to strange freaks, which sometimes show bad taste. A learned professor dedicated his book to his wife, but added "Baron's-widow" to her name, as she had married a baron before our lucky professor won her heart and her money. Society must know that the professor's wife was no ordinary person but a Baron's widow! Germany needs a breath of Democracy in order to disperse these

miasmatic vapours of mediæval feudalism which choke her spirit and smother her moral life. It is to be hoped that caste will also relax its hold on German society after the expulsion of the Hohenzollerns and the establishment of democratic institutions.

The history of Germany during the last fifty years may be described as the tragedy of a whole society. This nation is utterly sick in head and heart. It has lost its wits, and it has killed its conscience. "Whom the gods destroy, they first make mad," It will take a very long time to restore this demented and demoralised people to health and sanity.

SECTION II

IN CONSTANTINOPLE

“Where every prospect pleases,
And only man is vile.”

Bishop Heber.

IT is a great day in a young man's life when he first sees one of the ancient historic cities of the world, such as Rome, Athens, Benares or Constantinople. As I walked up the street leading from the railway station to the hotel in Stamboul my mind was in an ecstasy of delight and wonder. It was not what I saw, but what I thought of, that worked like magic in the brain. To a student of history Constantinople (which, fortunately, preserves its Greek name, in spite of the unspeakable Turk,) is a place of pilgrimage. Of course, the joy at the fulfilment of a long-cherished dream was mixed with deep sadness at the fate of the city, from which the scholars had gone forth to Italy with the balm of Greek learning for the sick and weary mediæval world. But it

was well that I could see it, even in its misery and degradation. The Turk will pass away, so said I, but the glory of this city will remain. Sooner or later it will be restored to its only rightful claimants, the Hellenes, whose name it bears. In the meantime I might learn what life here has to teach me.

It was in the spring and summer of 1915, when the loveliness of Nature stood in strange contrast to the carnage on the battlefields of Gallipoli. The Bosphorus, perhaps the most beautiful spot on earth, was a haven of calm and peace in the midst of this warring world of brute force and more brutish intrigue. But it was my business to watch the operation of political forces and to meet all types of characters in the course of the daily routine, for I was supposed to carry on political propaganda. I should have liked to live on the Bosphorus as a poet or a painter ; but, as I was neither the one nor the other, I had to make the best of the situation and figure as " a politician." I shall write about the chief lessons that I learned during my six months' sojourn in

that Dar-i-Saàdat, the seat of the Caliphate. I trust that all Orientals, and especially the Muslims of India and Egypt, will ponder well the meaning of my words.

I shall begin with the Turks. And the first thing I have to say is that the Turks, as a nation, are utterly unfit to assume the leadership of the Muslim world. They have been, and are, only a predatory tribe, without culture and political capacity. It was an evil day for the Muhammadan world when the Turk was entrusted with the Caliphate. The Turks have no brains ; that is the plain truth. They can fight well, but they cannot administer or organise. They have been in possession of a vast empire for several centuries ; but they have no great or noble national literature. All nations have produced great literature as the spiritual sign and symbol of their political ascendancy. Athens, Rome, Spain, Portugal, Elizabethan England and Vikram's India are now more familiar to us through the names of Æschylus, Sophocles, Virgil, Calderon, Camoens, Shakespeare and Kalidasa than those of the statesmen and warriors who

flourished during the periods of their political expansion. Political success has always led to the complete self-expression of a gifted nation in literature, art and philosophy. But we look in vain for these fruits of empire in Turkey. The Turks could not sing or speculate, as they are really very low in the scale of mental evolution. Nature has not endowed them with brains. They have also been the rulers of Greece; but they have learned nothing from their subjects, whose language is the key to the highest wisdom and culture. The Romans were also rude barbarians when they conquered Greece. But they yielded to the spell of Greek genius, and "conquered Greece conquered her conquerors," as the Roman poet truly declared. Rome produced great poets and thinkers under the tutelage of Greece, but the Turkish mind has been a barren soil which has brought forth nothing but the thorns and thistles of superstition and ribaldry. History has clearly demonstrated that the Turk has no intellectual potentialities. He is therefore really unfit for leadership of any kind, as a leader is distinguished

by his intellectual pre-eminence over his colleagues. How can such gifted peoples as the Egyptians and the Indians follow the guidance of the uncivilised and uncivilisable Turk? The Turk cannot guide; he is absolutely incompetent and helpless on account of his mental inferiority. An Egyptian gentleman, speaking of the Turks, said; "They know only two things, war and mosques." This is the opinion of a cultivated Muslim, who has lived about six years in Turkey. Another Muslim journalist said to me: "The Turks are the little brothers of the Prussians; they are stupid and arrogant."

Further, the Turks cannot administer or organise. Turkey has become the by-word of the modern age, because Turkish rule has been characterised by the grossest corruption, oppression and disorder. I speak of Turkish rule in countries inhabited chiefly by Muslims. Self-indulgence and indolence are the principal aims of the Turkish magnate. The Turks cannot govern little Syria well: how can they help other Muhammadans to acquire the capacity of

self-government? I once asked a Muslim physician in Berlin: "Why is there such misrule in Syria? Can't the Turkish Government organise an efficient police force?" He replied: "Yes; but the chief of police will himself join the robbers and highway-men of the country!" I then understood that it was really a hopeless case of degeneracy. Another Muslim politician, in the course of a discussion, said: "Yes, Syria is a very rich country; but the organisation of government——" and here he stopped short, as he did not wish to criticise the Ottoman Government adversely. But his sudden silence was more eloquent than any words could be. There was a painful pause, till I turned the conversation to other topics.

As the Turks are a barbarous tribe, the Muslims of India and Egypt make a great mistake in identifying their cause with the fortunes of the Ottomans. The Turks have repeatedly given proof of their brutality and depravity by organising massacres of peaceful Armenian and Greek populations and violating hundreds of Greek women, even

with the sanction of the police authorities. If this be Islam, I should blush for the faith of 70,000,000 of my Indian fellow-citizens. The civilised Muslims of India and Egypt lose immensely in the estimation of the Western world by associating with this semi-savage horde. Europe is free from religious fanaticism at present ; but Europe and America will " always be at war with Ottomanism," as President Taft has well said. If the Muslims of India wish to appear in company with their Hindu brethren on the public platforms of the civilised world, they must first wash their hands clean of Ottomanism in all its shapes and disguises. The Turkish system of ruling by massacre and rape is neither Islamic nor rational ; it is pure, unadulterated Ottoman savagery, worthy of Chengiz Khan and Halaku. We cannot make common cause with such marauders simply because they live east of Suez and profess Islam. The Muslims of India and Egypt must realise their own privileged position, and disclaim all connection with Central Asian freebooters.

During my stay in Constantinople I

learned that the Turks have no real sympathy with other Muslim nations. They are not Pan-Islamists ; they are Ottoman nationalists. But they wish to exploit and use other Muslim peoples for their own purposes with the cry of Pan-Islamism. Pan-Islamism is one of the most curious farces of the last decade. It simply means that other Muslim nations should sing the praises of the Turk and acknowledge his overlordship, and a few adventurers and charlatans from every Muslim land should swagger about in Stamboul on an allowance of £10 to £50 a month from the Turkish Government. This was all I could discover of the famous Pan-Islamic movement, which was supposed to be paving the way for the unification and revival of Islam under the leadership of the pious hero, Enver Pasha. The Turks care only for their own tribe ; they have no interest in the affairs or destinies of the millions of Muslims scattered in all parts of the world, from Java to Senegal. They must set their own house in order, and their policy is quite sound. They know that it is impossible to embody the spiritual unity

of Islam in an external political institution embracing all the Muslims of the world. This fantastic idea finds no favour among Turkish patriotic circles. But they do not frankly say so. They think that they can gain some sympathy (and sometimes money, too) by posing as the leaders of Islam, the custodians of the holy places, and the heirs of the traditions of the Caliphate. They pay a few pounds a month to several Indian, Egyptian, Algerian, Tunisian, Sudanese, and other Muslim enthusiasts to carry on Pan-Islamic propaganda for the glory of Turkey and the ministers of the Young Turk party. But they are not prepared to make any sacrifices for the common cause. If they get something as high priests of Pan-Islamism, well and good; but they will not risk anything for the sake of the other Muslim peoples. The Muslims of India and Egypt must realise that they worship a false idol when they waste their sympathies on Turkey as the head of Islam. Of course, the Turks were very glad to pocket a few lakhs of Indian money during the Balkan wars; and they sent a holy (or

ordinary) carpet with a message of thanks, which did not cost much. But there are millions of starving Muslim labourers in India who could have been helped with this money. We should know that charity begins at home. But it is the fashion of some Muslims to be enthusiastic about everything out of India, and to remain indifferent to the claims and needs of their co-religionists at home. Such an attitude is fostered by the hollow cant of Pan-Islamism. I have been at the heart and centre of Islam, in the innermost court of the shrine of Pan-Islamism ; and I declare that it is all a fraud and a hoax, designed to impose upon credulous Muslims in distant lands.

The Turks are very unpopular among all free Muslims. The only Muslims who swear by them seem to be those waifs and strays who have no country of their own. The Turks have shown themselves to be cruel, selfish, and arrogant. It is impossible to work with them. The most significant commentary on the Jihād proclaimed by the Turks has been furnished by the revolt

of the Arabian tribes against Ottoman rule. If the Turks were really faithful Pan-Islamists and worthy successors of the Caliphs, why should the pious Arabs try to overthrow Turkish rule in Arabia and Syria with the aid of the English, who are non-Muslims? This fact must open the eyes of all Muslims to the true situation. The Turks have even attempted to suppress the Arabic tongue in their dominions, as they have pursued the "patriotic" policy of "Ottomanising" all their subjects in language and thus securing uniformity in their much-divided empire. But the folly of such experiments is obvious, as the small, unlettered Turkish tribe cannot assimilate the numerous and cultured Arab nation. The Turks have thus no special claim on the sympathy of other Muslim patriots on the ground of "Pan-Islamic" interests. There is no such thing as Pan-Islamism. Nationalism is a living force in Persia, Arabia, Egypt, Turkey and Afghanistan. The Turks wish to stifle the national sentiment of the Egyptians and the Arabs, while they try every means of keeping Ottoman

patriotism alive ! Such is their boasted love of Islam. A Persian gentleman said to me : " These Turks are great humbugs. They wish that we should bow to them and serve their interests in the name of the Caliphate." For some time there was a big tempest in the teapot of Egyptian nationalism in Turkey. Some leaders proposed that the Egyptians should take up a Pan-Islamic position and lose their national identity as subjects of the Caliphate. Other more enlightened leaders opposed this mediæval policy and stood up for the traditions of the Egyptian National Party, which had adopted the motto : " Egypt for the Egyptians." These people wore buttons bearing the device of the Egyptian National Party (in addition to the Ottoman symbols); and this practice exposed them to the wrath of some Turkish ministers, as I heard from a reliable source. The pure " Nationalists " branded the other group as mercenaries, who had sold themselves to Turkey. This taunt seemed to derive further justification from the fact that most " Pan-Islamists " have been in the pay of the Turkish Government.

The "Pan-Islamists" retorted by stigmatising the Nationalists as infidels and thoughtless visionaries, who played into the hands of the English. The Turkish Government was even reported to have withdrawn its financial assistance from some Egyptian Nationalist leaders in Berlin, who found themselves in difficult circumstances on account of the exigencies of the war. The Turks did not like the national propaganda of the sincere Egyptian patriots, who insisted that Egypt was not a part of Turkey but an independent nation. The "Pan-Islamist" party had, of course, more money at its disposal and started a monthly journal in Berlin. But the majority of the contributors were always Germans, literary hacks, as far as I could see. This proved that the pro-Turkish group kept up an artificial existence bolstered with Turkish gold, but that the ablest Muslims held aloof from this mischievous movement.

An Egyptian physician once said to me :
" You must not confound us with the Turks. We have nothing in common with them except religion. We are an entirely different

people." There was much anxiety and trepidation among Egyptian patriots when it was known that the Turks were preparing an expedition against Egypt. Ottoman ambition ran high in the first year of the war. Every Turkish general compared himself to Saladin and Tarik. I heard that Djemal Pasha, who was in charge of the projected Egyptian expedition, had uttered this heroic sentiment: "I will conquer Egypt, or die." I remarked: "Well, we shall be very sorry to mourn his loss." The Egyptians were full of fears and misgivings. Egypt had had enough experience of Turkish inroads in the past. An Egyptian leader said to his colleague: "*Les Turcs mangeront l'Egypte*" ("The Turks will eat up Egypt"). The other replied, in a fit of Pan-Islamic fervour: "*Qu'ils mangent*" ("Let them do so"). But, on second thoughts, he admitted that a Turkish invasion would be a great misfortune for his fertile country. Such is the real opinion of enlightened Muslims about the Turks. It is also the opinion of the entire civilised world.

It is an open secret that there is no love

lost between the Turks and the Persians. During the war it was reported that Germany was frequently asked to act as arbitrator in disputes. The Turkish troops levied heavy contributions on the Persian towns which they occupied for some time in the early period of the war. The Turkish official reports spoke of the occupied Persian territory as "conquered regions" ("mamālik-i-maftuha"). This circumstance embittered the Persian Nationalists and revealed the real psychology of these self-styled friends of Islam. I heard that the Turks were hated by the population of the Persian provinces, which temporarily fell into their hands. It was the same old story of rapine, violence, and cruelty everywhere. The Persians came to the conclusion that the Turk was unteachable, and so he is.

I have come across several pathetic instances of waste of energy and enthusiasm due to the illusions of Pan-Islamism. A young man from Bombay, who had been an engineer in India, came to Turkey in order to take part in the "Holy War," as the law enjoined. He is a sincere and honest

Muslim. He distributed all his money among the poor, and went forth with the Turkish soldiers into the Sinai desert to strike a blow for the faith. His consistent idealism elicited the admiration of all his friends (who, however, did not follow his example). Our knight-errant fell ill and had to return to Damascus. He then discovered that the realities of Ottoman administration did not agree exactly with the dreams of ardent Pan-Islamists. No one cared for him as he lay sick in a small hotel in Damascus. He had given away all his hard-earned savings before donning his armour, but now the Caliphate did not help him in his distress. The sick hero was rescued from his woeful plight by some Hindu patriots, who heard about him from his friends in Constantinople. They immediately wired him money and asked him to join them after recovery—surely “a sadder and a wiser man.” I wonder what this intelligent Muslim now thinks of the “Caliphate.” I know several hot “Pan-Islamists” who refused to be naturalised as Ottoman subjects, as they were afraid of

being called upon to fight for the holy cause ! They are willing to spend their breath, but cannot do the first duty of a zealous " Pan-Islamist." Of such calibre are some noisy fanatics made ! The Indians resident in Turkey are generally wanderers or adventurers, who are not held in high esteem. A few old men live in the " takiya " (the poor-house). Some of them have married Turkish wives and speak Hindi mixed up with Turkish. They have lost touch with the Mother Country. They are almost always quarrelling among themselves from jealousy and selfishness. The Turkish Government has set apart a few pounds a month for Indian propagandists ; and there is a general scramble for this prize of indolent charlatanism. Invitations to dinner at the houses of some influential Turks also furnish an occasion for explosions of personal jealousy and uncharitableness. Nothing can be hoped for from this set. They will stew in their own juice for some time, till they are replaced by other Indian fugitives and sturdy vagabonds, who roam about in all Islamic lands.

I learned one lesson in Constantinople which I shall not easily forget. I have learned that good administration is a very rare thing in Asia. I could judge of the merits and demerits of Turkish rule by examining the state of affairs in Stamboul and its neighbourhood. Poverty broods over the whole place. Several quarters of the city present a shapeless mass of charred ruins, as they have not been rebuilt after a conflagration. I thought of San Francisco as I saw these tokens of Turkish lethargy and incompetence. No official is ever in a hurry to finish his work. Every little thing takes an interminably long time. It is the reign of "Yāvāsh! Yāvāsh!" (gently! gently!) I had the melancholy satisfaction of witnessing one of the big fires which are a regular feature of Constantinople life. The fire blazed away for ten hours. The small wooden houses of the poor were consumed and reduced to cinders in one street after another. The unlucky denizens fled into the big bazaar with bundles under their arms or small boxes on their shoulders—perhaps their entire earthly belongings. But what

was the Government doing? I saw a few ragged policemen and firemen running along the street several hours after the reddening sky had announced the danger to the whole town. This rabble of official rescuers was manipulating some antiquated apparatus and pouring a thin stream of water on the roaring sea of flames. It was a spectacle which was tragic and ludicrous at the same time. At last the fire abated; but I believe that it was due more to Nature than to the exertions of the Imperial Ottoman Government. I heard that conditions were still worse in the interior of the country. A patriotic Indian gentleman expressed this opinion as the outcome of his experiences of travel in Turkey: "After two years, I have come to the conclusion that the country should be annexed by some European Power!" And this gentleman is a sincere opponent of European imperialism in general. But he apparently thought that even European conquest was preferable in the interests of the people to Turkish "self-government." I was touched with deep pity as I saw the ranks of Turkish soldiers

marching past in the streets of Stamboul and Pera day after day in that eventful summer. These ignorant peasants and working men were torn from their homes and turned into food for cannon to gratify the ambition of a small class of Pashas and Beys, who had lived for generations on the plunder of subjugated countries. I noticed that Enver Pasha was reported in the papers to be always present at the weekly Selamlık, whether from piety or policy I could not judge. These demoralised bourgeois classes were trading on the religious idealism of a brave peasantry! I learned that more than half a million Turkish soldiers were slain on the peninsula of Gallipoli; but I believe that the ministers who drove them to the shambles are still living. They have fled from their country after having ruined it in their folly. The ambition of Turkish imperialists has laid Turkey in the dust. It was not necessary for Turkey to join the war as an enemy of England. The *Entente* was always ready even to grant important concessions to Turkey at the outbreak of the war. But the criminal stupidity of a few swashbucklers, who had

been educated in Germany, has brought this disaster on the Turkish people. This is the last sad consequence of inefficient administration. A land governed by fools cannot prosper.

The Muslims of India, Egypt, Java and Persia should learn that they must look after the affairs of their own countries in a practical spirit instead of dreaming of the Caliphate. There is nothing but dirt, and dead dogs, and scheming rascals in Stamboul. It is only distance that lends enchantment to the view in this case. Each Muslim nation should organise itself, and also, of course, sympathise with other Muslim countries. But every Muslim's duty lies at home, in the corner of the world where he is born.

"The old order changeth, yielding place to new." The Caliphate has had its day. The stream of history does not flow backward. Islam, as a religion, cannot be bound up with any particular theory of political organisation. We live in the twentieth century of the Christian era, not in the eighth. The Muslims should get rid of

these mediæval rags—the Caliphate and the Jihād. Islam, too, will pass away, for the world moves forward and will not wait for Islam or Hinduism or Buddhism. The Muslims should modernise themselves and learn the new ideas and ideals of the Western world. The vanguard of humanity to-day is in Europe and America, not in Arabia, Mesopotamia or Tibet. A new heaven and a new earth will be fashioned in the future, but not out of the *débris* of outworn creeds and formulæ. The educated Muslims should take the lead in assimilating modern modes of thought. This is not the time to live and die by dispensations which were great and new forces centuries ago. Prophets may come and prophets may go, but Humanity goes on for ever in its pursuit of truth and virtue. The Muslims should also advance with the times, and must not “ attempt the future’s portals with the past’s blood-rusted key.”

The sad fate of the Turkish people proves that there is no magic in national “ self-government ” as such. It all depends on the character and capacity of the governing

class, for the peasants and the working men cannot take part in the administration. They pay taxes, and expect to receive the benefits of a sound administration in return. The upper and middle classes of Egypt, India and Persia cannot administer successfully without European control and guidance. They are wanting in energy, public spirit and technical knowledge. They can neither organise the defence of the country nor establish a good system of internal government. A mixed European and Oriental administration is the best for these countries, as the European officials are honest, energetic and capable, while the Orientals know the customs and traditions of the people. There is no harm in admitting that the upper and middle classes of Asia are not fit for all the tasks of progressive administration in this age. The Turkish Government had to employ European engineers for the Hedjaz railway. The Persians invited an American to put their finances in order, and paid Swedish officers to organise a police force for them. Such a mixed administration already exists in countries

which form part of the British and the French colonial empires, though the European element is perhaps unnecessarily large and the Oriental colleagues are not given their due. These are minor faults, but the principle of the mixed *personnel* is sound. Among European nations, England has been already in the field for a century, and France has also acquired vast dependencies in Asia and Africa. It is, therefore, wise to co-operate with these nations for the establishment and continuance of good government in Asiatic countries, whatever colour the flag may have. The interests of the peasants and working men of Asia require peace, order, justice, education, organisation, and permanent contact with Europe and America. A purely national administration in an Oriental country, composed of the effeminate sons of the land-owners, lawyers, bankers, manufacturers, priests and other parasitic classes, cannot secure these blessings for the people. They must be trained, controlled and inspired by European officials, or worse than Turkish disorder would ensue. The people of Asiatic

countries cannot pay the high price of perpetual misrule and stagnation for the satisfaction of seeing a national flag float over the public buildings of the capital. For purposes of external defence, co-operation between Englishmen and the Indians or the Egyptians is also imperatively necessary. Egypt, Persia and India would be again overrun by barbarians if England were to withdraw from Asia, as the Britons were enslaved by the Teutons as soon as the Roman garrisons left the country. It is, therefore, necessary to readjust our views to the actual circumstances of the situation as this war has revealed them to us. We should think of the British (and the French) Empires as single political units, which must be preserved in their integrity for a long time to come. We must fight for the defence of these States against external invasion, for the dissolution of these Empires can result only in a change of masters for us. At the same time, we should try to educate and elevate the people by teaching them to appreciate English and French ideals and setting on foot popular movements for the

extension of democratic institutions in Asia and Africa. "Self-government" under a purely Oriental governing class would be no blessing for the peasants and the working men, and would finally lead to conquest by some European power. The system of mixed administration seems to be the only natural and necessary solution of the problem. Then the fires in Constantinople would be extinguished promptly and effectively by trained firemen working under European leadership. And that is what the people of Asia ask for.

SECTION III

"ASIA MINOR" IN BERLIN

"The best-laid plans of mice and men
Gang aft a-gley."

R. Burns.

ORIENTAL life in Berlin during the war was quite picturesque and many-sided. But it was something of a tragedy, as I shall have occasion to show in the sequel. There were all nations of the East in the streets of Berlin: conceited Young Turks, fussy Egyptians, acute but pessimistic Persians, nondescript Arabs, handsome Georgians and others, who fancied that the triumph of German arms would redress the wrongs of their countries. Berlin was the Mecca of Oriental patriots of all shades of opinion. Their common bond was hatred of England and France. Every one formed plans for the regeneration of his Fatherland after the war. Their optimism was rather premature, as the ruthless logic of events has demonstrated. But during the first two years of

the war these Oriental nationalists were elated with high hopes and went about in a state of political intoxication produced by a too ample dose of the Pan-Germanic "hasheesh." Thus a noted middle-aged Egyptian politician said on one occasion : " The liberation of Egypt is certain. I am 100 per cent. sure of it." A party of young Egyptian students met in solemn conclave one day to discuss the measures to be taken immediately after the end of the war ! It is worth remembering as a joke of the war-time that some Egyptian politicians had even nominated themselves in imagination to the highest offices of state in free Egypt ! The Turks were all chauvinistic, and it was their habit to decry other Islamic nations. Thus a young Turkish official said to me : " You know it is pure Turkish blood, Anatolian blood, that has been shed at Gallipoli. We Turks have thus saved the cause of Islam. Others have done nothing. We pity poor India and the Indian people." The supercilious tone of these remarks well illustrates the spirit of the new Turkish imperialists. Some Algerians also carried

on their "propaganda" in bad French. One of them delivered a public lecture, which was insufferably dull, and which really proved that the people of Algeria were not discontented with French rule. But the obtuse patriot could not see the point. Unbounded optimism and sincere faith in the power and professions of Germany were common to all these Oriental "Nationalists." As I contemplated their somewhat sad countenances and heard their plaintive accents, I was touched with pity, as I knew that they sighed for an irrevocable past. They talked of the "Caliphate," of the age of the Crusades, of the *Jihād-i-Akbar*! I could not tell them all I thought. They were the rearguard of a vanishing host, not the pioneers of a new generation. They fed themselves on words, words, words. And they rejoiced at the German victories, as if they could sustain themselves by vicarious strength. And at last that bubble, too, burst!

There were influences at work which began to mar the joy and weaken the self-confidence of this carnival of hope. As

usual, these Muslim patriots and Pan-Islamists could not get on with the Prussians. No one can get on with the Prussians. It is, of course, dangerous to deal in general maxims ; but I give a safe rule for all Orientals to follow : " Never have anything to do with a Prussian." The chances are that you will rue your folly if you disregard this precept. These Orientals, thus gathered together in Berlin, soon found out that they lived in a society of snobs, bullies, boors, churls and cads. An Arab gentleman was once heard to say, " The English are at least gentlemen," and this utterance was reported against him. A Turkish journalist arrived one day in high glee, visited some Prussians, and left for Constantinople the same evening ! He had had enough of Germany and the Germans in the course of twelve hours. Some rude affront or arrogant phrase had revealed the true Prussian to him, and he was disgusted and disheartened beyond measure. An Egyptian patriot, who was an enthusiastic admirer of the Germans before he came to Berlin, at last uttered this remarkable sentiment :

“ When peace comes, I shall leave this country the same evening without waiting to take my luggage with me ! ” On other occasions he would grumble and say, “ They treat us like dogs.” He also related to me that a high Egyptian official, who was invited to Berlin, left with this commentary on the situation : “ They play with us like children. Do they think I am a boy ? ” A Persian gentleman was once talking to me of his future plans of work. I said, in a tone of banter, “ Well, you will surely marry a pretty German girl, and settle in this country.” To my surprise, he said : “ Je n’aime pas les Allemands ” (“ I do not like the Germans ”). We spoke French on this occasion. I did not pursue the conversation further. If I had asked him, he would undoubtedly have told me his story. There is a world of meaning in that short and pithy remark : “ Je n’aime pas les Allemands.” The reason is not far to seek. The Prussians are a selfish, rude, and arrogant people. They look upon themselves as demi-gods, as veritable super-men. They suffer from incurable megalomania. Their success in the

war of 1870-I has turned their heads. They believe that they are the greatest nation on earth, and that all others are miserable worms and mannikins. They are not bound to show courtesy to inferior creatures. They must teach these Orientals that they are not the equals of the divine German race. The German is born to rule, and all others to serve. This inordinate pride must estrange all friends and alienate the sympathies of colleagues and fellow-workers. The course of events has in this case proved the wisdom of the old saying: "Pride goeth before destruction, a haughty spirit before a fall." The Germans could not win over the Orientals in Berlin because their frog-in-the-well pride robbed them of manners. The Orientals are noted for their politeness, which they even carry to excess. But the Germans are extremely deficient in this common virtue. Courtesy is the lubricant of social life, and the absence of it in German society naturally led to continual friction. I know of no Oriental who left Berlin with feelings of esteem and friendship for the Germans. I used to laugh and say: "If

you want to make a man anti-German, send him to Berlin." It was a most curious and instructive phenomenon. All persons who have lived in Paris or London love France and England ever afterwards. They have pleasant memories of their sojourn among cultivated and sociable gentlemen. But every foreigner who spends some time in Prussia feels as if he were living in a menagerie. He meets only with insults and rebuffs on all sides ; he is robbed, overreached, and exploited by every one whom he encounters. These Oriental patriots were not by any means peculiarly unfortunate in their experiences. A Spanish gentleman expressed this opinion in the presence of several Germans : " I admire Germany as a powerful State ; but I don't like the individual Germans " (" aber die einzelnen Deutschen liebe ich nicht "). He related to me how he had to suffer at the hands of these unscrupulous, greedy, and intolerable Berlin people during his stay in Germany. I am sure that that young Spaniard will never say a good word for Germany in his life. The same result was produced by similar

circumstances in the case of the Orientals who flocked to Berlin in such a devout spirit in the first year of the war. That was surely a sad disappointment. But worse was to follow.

Want of manners is not the only fault through which the Germans have lost the sympathy of the Oriental representatives in Berlin. There are other vices in the German character which have made personal confidence and co-operation impossible. I generalise from numerous single incidents, as I have been an amused spectator of many a tragi-comic affair in this little Oriental world, this "Asia Minor" of Berlin. The root of the whole trouble is that the Germans have no character. They are a mean and dishonourable people; in fact, they are singularly devoid of the sense of honour. They work hard, and are patriotic, but that is perhaps their only virtue. Their best and best-educated men tell lies and break their promises in the most important affairs of life. They seem to think that they are really "above good and evil," if one may judge from the nonchalant spirit in which

they deal with questions involving the gravest consequences to others. They never think of the other persons, always of themselves. Self is their god, and they have no regard for anybody where their interests or even their whims are concerned. Now this trait in the German character must make all co-operation impossible. Society is based on truth and mutual regard. If a man in authority is known to be unreliable, the State, which he represents, must fail in its plans and enterprises, as no one will work for or with him for a long time. The Germans can never inspire confidence in others, for they are a dishonourable people. They will injure others without remorse or compunction in order to serve their interests even in small matters. Thus a distinguished scholar was prevented from leaving Berlin for Constantinople, presumably because some petty subaltern wished to exploit him in Berlin. Of course, that man has a grievance against Germany. A gentleman was asked to come all the way from the United States at considerable personal sacrifice to himself; but he was left

in the lurch after his arrival in Europe because the little Prussian despot of the office had changed his mind. An energetic Oriental gentleman was requested to undertake some very important work in a neutral country ; but he found that the German had not fulfilled his part of the bargain, and he was in a difficult and even dangerous situation for some time. A noted Egyptian leader was at first asked to write an article for a semi-official paper ; but the German editor refused to publish it or *to return it to him* after he had spent much time and money on it ! He was told that his article had been disposed of in a proper manner ! When he asked me how I explained such absurd tomfoolery, I said : “ How can I tell you ? I am not a German.” These are small matters, but a multitude of small matters constitute the business of life everywhere. And character is often revealed in small affairs. But the Germans have displayed the same disregard for truth and fair-play in very serious matters, in which the lives and fortunes of their friends were at stake. Such consistent and invariable

meanness is suicidal, and to-day one may say that Germany has not a single friend in Asia. On this occasion I confine my remarks to the daily happenings in the piebald, polyglot circle in Berlin, which I actually frequented for a long time. In fact, the unaccountably mean ways of the Germans formed a staple subject of conversation among the Orientals. There was always some scandal going on. It was not a question of personalities. It was always the same, whoever the parties concerned happened to be. Every one complained, sooner or later, that he had been exploited, or deceived, or insulted, or otherwise ill-treated by some German with whom he had to deal. I at first thought that these accusations could not be taken seriously, as misunderstandings often arise in the course of affairs, and these Orientals might possibly be vain and sensitive young men. But I was led to inquire further, when the cases multiplied with lapse of time. I noticed that Oriental gentlemen of the most diverse types of character had the same thing to say. I finally came to the conclusion that the evil

lay in the character of the nation, and not in the incapacity or idiosyncrasy of particular Germans here and there. I could not find any other explanation of this remarkable phenomenon. I shall have occasion to revert to this question in discussing the failure of the German agents in Turkey and Persia, for it may be affirmed that the Germans have lost the war because they deserved to lose it. The Germans themselves are the worst enemies of Germany. It is not primarily the blockade or the American Army that has ruined Germany ; it is the German character, or rather the characterlessness of the German people, that has led to this national catastrophe.

The iniquitous treaty of Brest-Litovsk, which marked the culmination of Germany's military successes during the war, also caused a reaction in the attitude of most Orientals towards Germany. A few far-sighted politicians among them had begun to dread German supremacy in Asia ever since the conquest of Servia in the winter of 1915-16. The "Balkanzug" (train) made the first journey to Constantinople in

January, 1916, I believe. There was great jubilation in the German press. Huge placards with the words "Hamburg-Bagdad" could be seen in the windows of the newspaper offices. I read an article in a review on "The Way to India." The land route to Asia had been secured. German legions could now really march from "Hamburg to Bagdad" without let or hindrance. This cry sounded ominous in our ears. It was more than we had bargained for. The Germans had succeeded too well. The Oriental patriots wished that Germany should help them, but no one desired such dangerous proximity. A German Empire in Asia was the last thing they would tolerate. I also began to doubt if I had been following the right policy in working with the Germans. Germany went on from victory to victory, till the collapse of Russia in the winter of 1917-18 seemed to crown her wildest hopes with success. Many superficial observers thought that Germany had won the war. At this time an Egyptian gentleman said to me: "From this day, this country is a menace to the whole

world." I said (for I could not speak frankly): "Oh, no. I don't think so." He rejoined: "They can even conquer Egypt now. For who will prevent them?" I said: "Well, let us hope for the best."

With regard to the Indian Nationalists in Berlin, I observed that the greater part of their time and energy was spent in quarrelling among themselves and telling lies against one another. They had not much work; and idle hands always find mischief to do. Some of the leading members came from words to blows on one occasion, and each party averred that the other had commenced the attack. Such a combination of pugilistic and "patriotic" activity caused quite a scandal in Berlin. One of them went about slandering his colleagues everywhere, and told his German and Oriental acquaintances that the other Indians were thieves, swindlers and impostors. These gentlemen were supposed to be members of an association, or "Gesellschaft"; but they could never work together harmoniously. I had no direct knowledge of the corporate activities of this association after

the winter of 1915-16 ; but I learned something now and then from the conversation and correspondence of a few friends. There were all kinds of people in that association : sincere but misguided patriots, unprincipled adventurers, self-indulgent parasites, scheming, notoriety hunters, simple-minded students, and some victims of circumstance. The number was never very large. Some pamphlets were written, and some foolish intrigues were set on foot. On the whole, the group made a very unfavourable impression on Berlin society on account of its perpetual quarrels and splits. The Germans also paid money for their own selfish purposes, but they had no respect for such needy " patriots." Some of the members tried to ingratiate themselves with the German officials by acting as mercenary German agents and meddling with matters which were not related in any way to the Indian movement. There was much hobnobbing with Irishmen, Egyptians and other anti-English agitators. But nothing came out of it. A deputation visited Constantinople, but could not get on with the Turks. It

returned to Berlin without achieving any results. Some young men went to Bagdad and Persia, but, as usual, there was more quarrelling than work even there. Some of them complained bitterly of the bigotry of the Turks. At the end a few young men remained in Berlin without any definite aims or plans.

The story of the Indians in Berlin only proves that the upper and middle classes of Indian society cannot be expected to lead the country forward. These men have a smattering of European knowledge, and the contact with European civilisation rouses their pride and ambition to a certain degree. But they have no faith or capacity. They belong to no organised Church, in India or abroad. They do not know much about their national literature and history. They are denationalised and demoralised through the influence of their unnatural environment. Their whole life is a hothouse growth. Nothing great or noble can come from this effete class, wherever its representatives may try to work. They will always be indolent, vain, egotistic and incompetent.

Their character has no deep roots in religious principles or national institutions. Religion and nationality are the two great forces that mould human character. A healthy and normal society is organised as a Church and a State. The upper and middle classes of India do not belong to any Church or State. They have lost faith in the old Indian creeds, and have found no new evangel. They have lost their national independence, but they have not yet learned to love and cherish the institution known as the British Empire. Their souls must therefore languish and wither in a spiritual vacuum. I cannot suggest any infallible remedies for this distemper ; but I have here supplied a sound diagnosis. Time will show if the malady is curable. Of course, these remarks do not apply to the people living in the semi-independent Indian States.

The experience of the Indian Nationalists in Berlin confirms my opinion that the Germans are an anti-social and unreliable people, especially the Prussians, who occupy the position of leadership. After four years of unremitting activity for the German

cause, one of them wrote : " The Germans treat even their best friends as mere agents." Another prominent member of the association said : " You may give your life for them, but they never trust you." On another occasion he remarked : " I am sorry I came to Berlin " (from the United States). " I have lost my last chance of returning to India." A young Indian gentleman served the German Government so faithfully in the Near East that he was awarded the Iron Cross. But our hero had the unpleasant experience of being put in prison some time after his return to Berlin, probably because he had criticised some German officials or quarrelled with one of the " bosses " of the association. I do not know all the facts of the case, but such amenities of the Indo-Germanic life in Berlin gave the Indians a bad name in Oriental society. It may be affirmed that all the Indians are thoroughly disgusted with the Germans, but they cannot say so. India should know that the few Indians who have worked with the Germans during the war have not the slightest desire to

repeat the experiment. We have learned much, and we do not wish to have anything to do with the Germans again.

I may be excused for adding an autobiographical note at this point. I spent about forty-four months in Germany and Turkey, from February, 1915, to October, 1918. I went from Switzerland to Berlin in the last week of January, 1915, and worked earnestly till February, 1916, with the Germans and the Turks for what I then believed to be the common cause of India and Germany. During that one year I learned that the triumph of Germany would be a great calamity for Asia and the whole world. On account of differences of opinion I made up my mind to return to Switzerland. During the winter of 1915-16 I twice asked the responsible German official for a passport for the journey to Switzerland, politely adding that I wished to return to Switzerland for the benefit of my health. Of course, he knew why I had decided to leave Germany. At first he said that he advised me as a friend to stay in Germany. But he threw off the mask the second time,

and replied in these words : " You will on no account be allowed to leave Germany." I then knew how matters stood. I found myself in a very dangerous position, as I was evidently regarded as an " anti-German " Oriental. In the summer of 1916 even my local correspondence was intercepted by the Berlin police. I was, of course, very anxious about the future, as these German bureaucrats might treat me as an enemy, and I was completely in their power. During three years, from February, 1916, to February, 1919, I was compelled to resort to falsehood and dissimulation in self-defence, and I look back upon that time as a period of utter degradation. But I was not a free agent. At last I persuaded the German officials that my persecution was really due to a misunderstanding, and obtained permission in November, 1917, to go to Stockholm for propaganda. For a long time I could not get the Swedish " visa " for the journey. Circumstances beyond my control also prevented me from writing, speaking, or working openly according to my real convictions during four months after my arrival

in Stockholm on October 10th, 1918. At last I was happy to be able to sever all connection with the German Government on February 20th, 1919, when I voluntarily returned my German passport to the German Legation in Stockholm. As I was detained in Germany during nearly one and a half years, and could not go to a neutral country, my health suffered very much on account of the scarcity of food in Germany. All the other Orientals and Indians went to neutral countries from time to time for a short holiday ; and the German official himself ran to Switzerland to eat and drink. But I was not allowed to go, as I was under the official ban from February, 1916, to November, 1917. The German Government inflicted all this loss of time and health on me by keeping me against my will in Germany after the winter of 1915-16. This incident also illustrates German autocratic and bureaucratic methods. I insert these personal details only because I believe that my Indian friends may be interested in them.

I think I may here mention my visit to Sir Roger Casement in Berlin. He was staying

at the Hotel Continental. I was introduced, with other friends, by a common acquaintance. Sir Roger was very affable and made a favourable impression on all who saw him. This was in 1915, in the early period of the war. I had no discussion with him, as the disparity of age was a bar to familiarity. But I can assert without fear of contradiction that Sir Roger Casement was deeply disappointed at the close of his stay in Germany. At first his friends commented on his habit of spending much time in Munich instead of Berlin, where political questions were supposed to be settled. He had come on a political mission, and was expected to be in close touch with the highest authorities of the realm. But it was generally known that Sir Roger "did not like" Berlin. This strange "dislike" of the capital of the Empire, whose support he solicited for his Fatherland, appeared to me to betoken want of tact. But how could an experienced man like him be wanting in tact? I was rather puzzled till I heard some one say: "They did not treat him well here in Berlin." Thus I learned that

it was the same old story of arrogance and rudeness. Truly, the Prussians are no respecters of persons in these matters! Finally, a German friend of Sir Roger's said to me: "He had no high opinion of the Germans. He used to say '*They don't know their own mind. They make promises which they do not keep. They are dishonourable.*' He was very much disappointed." When I listened to these words I was confirmed in my own views on the question. Sir Roger Casement, the elderly gentleman and much-travelled diplomat, who had seen the world and known much more about it than a studious youth like myself, has expressed this opinion as his verdict against Germany. The Orientals may distrust my judgment, but they cannot surely dismiss Sir Roger's severe indictment with contempt. Sir Roger Casement must be heard, and his testimony is given against these Germans.

SECTION IV

THE GERMANS IN ASIA

“ As when a prowling wolf,
Whom hunger drives to seek new haunt for prey,
Watching where shepherds pen their flocks at eve,
In hurdled cotes amid the field secure,
Leaps o’er the fence with ease into the fold.”

Milton : “ Paradise Lost.”

THE German adventure in Asia has ended in complete disaster. Friends of freedom can now survey the world with less dismay than in the winter of 1917-18. The Germans got their chance through the unaccountable folly of the Turks. Germany conquered Turkey without a blow, for the Turks themselves opened the doors for these greedy birds of prey. Personal influence played an important part in Turkey, and two or three men were really responsible for this rash step. The Turks were also too much in a hurry. They declared war on the *Entente* only three months after the

outbreak of hostilities in Europe. They could not judge who would win the war. It was the puerile short-sightedness and impetuosity of hot-headed youths. The older men advised a policy of waiting and watching. Turkey knew that she had some moral influence in the Islamic world ; and that England and France had millions of Muhammadan subjects. But she deliberately allied herself with the German Imperialists, and deserves no sympathy now. History cannot undo what has been done. As Lowell says :—

“ Once to every man and nation comes the moment
to decide,
In the strife of Truth with Falsehood, 'twixt the
good and evil side :
Some great Cause, God's new Messiah, offering each
the bloom or blight,
Parts the goats upon the left hand and the sheep
upon the right,
And the choice goes by for ever 'twixt that Dark-
ness and that Light.”

The Turks allowed the Germans to enter Asia in their thousands. But the result has been just the reverse of what was expected. The Germans have failed miserably, not

only from the military standpoint, but also in a moral sense. They are now hated and despised wherever they have shown themselves during the war, from Stamboul to Kabul, and from Medina to Teheran. This is the outcome of four years of German intrigue and diplomacy in Asia. Whatever may happen in future, no German is likely to inspire confidence in the East, and Germany will never be able to carry out any programme of Oriental politics. Germany is to-day morally bankrupt in Asia.

The causes of this interesting phenomenon are various and manifold. The Germans soon showed that they were no friends of Turkey and Persia. They were discovered to be wolves in sheep's clothing. They professed to come as allies and champions of the Orient, but they could not even conceal their selfish designs in the Near East. They convinced all Orientals that their real objects were plunder and conquest. They did not sincerely wish that Turkey and Persia should be helped to free themselves from the incubus of European imperialism for ever. They only wanted that the Germans

should rule and exploit the Asiatics instead of the Russians. It was the old story of the horse, the stag, and the man over again. Falsehood and hypocrisy in this essential matter alienated all who were at first disposed to welcome them in spite of their faults. German ambition was so impatient that it could not even adopt the language of courtesy and amity. The Germans, by their words and deeds, repelled every Oriental patriot, and caused a revulsion of feeling in favour of England. During the war the Germans have been the worst enemies of Germany everywhere. A German officer, who was travelling with an Egyptian Nationalist leader, said in course of conversation: "Would you prefer a German occupation of Egypt?" This characteristic remark was, of course, repeated and passed from mouth to mouth. I took a trip on the Bosphorus with a young German official, and we talked of the future of Turkey. I said: "When Turkey has a better Government and more money the Bosphorus will grow into a much-frequented summer resort. It is more beautiful than the Riviera in

winter." To my surprise, the German replied : " Yes, but the Turks can't do anything. We should rule here." I didn't know what to say to this indiscreet imperialist after such a cynical confession. I can cite only such incidents as came under my personal observation. I guess that the official courier of the German Embassy must have transmitted interesting correspondence with regard to the aggressive plans of German statesmen in Asia. Those documents must be in the German archives, and may be given to the world some day. I can speak only as a private person, whose sources of information were limited to occasional conversation with friends and acquaintances. A Turkish official said to me : " The Germans have refused to build a modern arsenal for us here, as they do not wish to make us strong. Their idea is that they may rule over us in future if we remain weak." Such was the much-trumpeted friendship of the Germans for the Turks ! I am sure that the Germans must have divulged their real intentions in a thousand different ways, as they worked with the Turks and the

Persians at that time. The German press did not take care to be reticent or hypocritical. The newspapers wrote in tones of exultation about German expansion in Mesopotamia and the bright prospects in Persia. All this incriminating testimony convinced the Turks and the Persians that they had to deal with very dangerous enemies.

The Germans could not get on with the Turks, the Arabs and the Persians, especially as the majority of them were Prussians. The incurable boorishness and tactlessness of the Prussians made co-operation impossible. A Hungarian officer related to me how some German officers threw Turkish gentlemen out of a railway carriage in order to get seats for themselves. Such incidents must have occurred very frequently, as it was the general opinion that the Germans had no manners. This fault is enough to ruin a man in Asia, for we Orientals believe that courtesy is the beginning of morality, and I think we are right. A man who cannot even be polite must certainly be an unsociable creature. The Prussians failed

at Bagdad on account of their inability to work with the Turks there. There was nothing but continual friction and personal bickering all the time.

“The churl in spirit, howe’er he veil
His want in forms for fashion’s sake,
Will let his coltish nature break
At seasons through the gilded pale.”

With the Germans, however, the “coltish nature” was very much on the surface. Such people may be in their element at Potsdam, but they are utterly unfit for political enterprises in Asia. The German cannot divest himself of his character simply by crossing the Hellespont; for who can escape from himself? A Muslim scholar, who travelled with a German mission to a distant country, at last wrote that the “ill-tempered” Prussian officer, who was his colleague, had marred all chances of success at the court of the Asiatic ruler. Another Oriental gentleman, who also took part in this mission, was so deeply offended with the Prussian officer that he ceased to be on speaking terms with him after a short time, and subsequently drew up an indictment

consisting of more than sixty articles against him !. He also wrote from Bagdad, which was only the first stage on the journey : " I cannot bear slights all the time." This Prussian hero did not know how to behave towards others ; he was so full of self-importance and German conceit that he lost all sense of proportion. The Prussians are experts in the art of losing friends. They have great projects of world dominion, but they don't know that diplomacy without manners cannot succeed.

The Germans have not only behaved like uncultivated barbarians in personal intercourse in Asia, but they have also acted like false and unprincipled scoundrels. This is a much more serious matter, which touches the very kernel of the question. The Germans do not keep faith with their colleagues ; they are untruthful and untrustworthy. Their word cannot be trusted. In spite of their much-advertised " Kultur," they have not learned the simple virtue of truthfulness. They also do not know that " honesty is the best policy " in the long run. They set out on a campaign of world-empire and pitted

their strength against the English. But they did not provide themselves with the armour that the Englishman wears in the East. The English are on the whole a truthful people ; that is perhaps their characteristic virtue. Whatever policy the State may adopt, the individual Englishman is a reliable person. He keeps his word. And the English Government also keeps faith with its friends, partly from policy, and partly from the national habit of truthfulness. The Englishman has acquired a reputation for truthfulness in Asia. Several years ago a hotel proprietor in a small island in the West Indies said to me : " The English are different from other people. If an Englishman says he will do a thing, you may be sure that he will do it." The Englishman also trusts others, as he wishes that he should be trusted. An Egyptian Nationalist, who is a violent anti-British agitator, said to me : " If a man works with the English they will never believe anything against him." This virtue of truthfulness gains friends and makes co-operation possible. But with the Germans

it is all the other way. They wish only to exploit their Oriental colleagues and then to desert or ill-treat them. They make promises and never keep them, as Sir Roger Casement also found out too late. A Government must never cheat its friends, or it will soon have no friends at all. And a diplomat's word must be as good as his bond. The Germans have acted like a dishonest, short-sighted business man. But they could not help it; they could not change their national character in a day. A German promised a reward of £60 to a poor Indian who had saved his life in Arabia; he gave the promise in writing. But the Germans in Constantinople thought that they need not pay so much, seeing that the officer was now in safety. After much haggling they paid a small amount (perhaps £20). These are the methods of the mighty German Imperial Government in Asia! A German induced some Persian chiefs to come to Constantinople, but when they arrived there no one cared for them. They regretted very keenly that they had accepted the invitation. At last the Turks heard that

they were in a difficult situation, and helped them with money and other necessities. A German officer promised to take a young Indian with him to Persia, and told him that he should make preparations for the journey. After a few days I learned that the German had already left! The young Indian enthusiast was very angry and lost much of his ardour for the German cause. The Englishman never plays such tricks in his dealings with individuals. I had no opportunity of travelling in Turkey and Persia during the war; but I am sure that the Germans have left behind them a damning record of broken promises, unfulfilled engagements, and unredeemed pledges all over the Near East. They will live in Oriental tradition as liars and swindlers for a long time to come, for the East does not easily forget. A Persian politician said to me: "They gave us all sorts of promises, and now we are in a worse position than before. We counted upon them, but they have done nothing." The German's unscrupulous methods have set off the Englishman's habitual truthfulness to greater advantage

than ever before. The people have had the opportunity of comparing the two nations with each other. It may be affirmed that the Germans would have a much better reputation in Asia to-day if they had never gone there. In their case that fallacious proverb is certainly true: "Familiarity breeds contempt." And the reason is that they are really contemptible.

The Germans have forfeited the sympathy of the Orientals not only through their arrogance and their unreliable character, but also because they have shown themselves to be inconceivably greedy locusts. They have taken to plunder and extortion, while they pretended to come as friends and deliverers! A Turkish official said to me: "They are too greedy, and they have the wrong psychology." An Indian colleague told me that the Germans had looted banks in Persia on the pretext that they were English banks. The Persians thought that the Germans would help them to organise their country; but they found that the newcomers were bent only on carrying booty home. It is almost incredible that

“honourable” German officers should even be accused of such rapacious conduct in countries where they wished to acquire prestige and influence. But the German is capable of committing every crime in dealing with other peoples, especially as he thinks that he himself is a being of another species. He does not admit that any moral law is binding on him in his relations with foreigners, Europeans or Orientals. He pursues what he calls his “nigger-politik” towards them and treats them like primitive savages or irrational brutes. A German official actually expressed these sentiments in a letter, which was intercepted by the Persians by a lucky chance. The worthy Teuton was obliged to explain away his contemptuous remarks about the Orientals ; but it may be imagined that he could never again be popular among the Persians. An Indian gentleman, who knows Persia well, told me that the Germans had behaved like unprincipled freebooters and blackmailers in Persia. He related several stories of their brutality and avarice in dealing with the helpless people of that unfortunate

country. Well may the Orientals exclaim
“ Save us from our friends.”

The Germans cannot trust others, as they themselves are untrustworthy. They are always suspicious of their friends. They have very peculiar methods of work. One German is sent out to spy upon another German. I think that half the German officials or agents working in neutral countries were spying on the other half. A German journalist once said to me : “ A German never trusts another German.” I asked : “ Is it because you know one another so well ? ” He also said of the officials of a certain department : “ They are all working very hard ; but they are working against one another.” When the Germans treat one another in this way it is easy to understand why they cannot trust foreigners. Being themselves devoid of the sense of honour, they think that others are also like them, as every man judges his neighbours by his own standard. The entire German system of government is based on the principle of mutual spying and back-biting. When such methods are adopted in

intercourse with the Orientals the consequences are ruinous. In such co-operation the slightest rift in the lute will make the music altogether mute. I shall relate an amusing story to illustrate German methods of work. A German official received certain letters from some Persian Nationalists to forward them to other members of the party. He first opened them, thus proving that he was not a gentleman. He then gave them to another Persian journalist to translate them for him. Now it so happened that the Nationalists had warned their comrade in those letters against the wiles of this very journalist, who was regarded by them as an unscrupulous and unpatriotic charlatan. It may be imagined that the journalist was not quite pleased to read what was written about him and to see himself as the others saw him. He read the letters to the German official, perhaps omitting the passages that referred to himself. I believe he subsequently protested to the Nationalists against the aspersions on his character. The mean, underhand ways of the German official were thus made known to all the Orientals. We

all enjoyed the joke, but also learned a lesson. Who would entrust this German again with confidential letters? And these Germans are all alike; they all act in the same manner. We have found it out in the course of prolonged experience of their habits. They can never gain the esteem or good-will of Oriental gentlemen. An Oriental gentleman, who joined a German mission to an Asiatic Court, was placed in a very undignified position on his arrival in that distant land, as the German officer did not supply him with money, and he was finally treated as a guest by his new friends. He had come as one of the diplomatic representatives of the German Empire, but had to stay as a beggar. He had sacrificed much for the Germans, but he did not receive a single farthing for his work from the German officer. I am sure he would never have come to Berlin if he had known the Germans before. But we were all ignorant of German aims, methods and moral standards, as the Germans had never come into close contact with the Orientals before the war. German ingratitude and baseness can

go so far that the Prussian officer even tried to get him locked up as a lunatic on his return to Berlin in the spring of 1918, after a journey full of great hardships and perils ! And a responsible German official conveyed to him the comforting message that he would not be allowed to leave the countries of Germany's allies. Thus he was practically interned by the Germans, after he had made such enormous sacrifices for what we in 1915 erroneously believed to be the common cause of India and Germany ! Such is the guerdon of all who work for or with the Germans. It is necessary that all India should know this sequel of the story. The German autocrats must not fancy that they can exploit and persecute honest Orientals with impunity. There is nothing hidden that shall not be made public, so long as I have the power to speak and write. I have heard from an Indian Nationalist that the Germans are also responsible for the prosecution of the Indian Nationalists in the United States, as the German officials gave over to the American police the cypher with which documentary evidence against our mis-

guided and impulsive young patriots could be obtained. In plain words, the Germans betrayed their Indian colleagues! The American Government must be praised for the leniency with which our countrymen have been treated by the liberal-minded judges of that great Republic, for they had put themselves in a very dangerous predicament by intriguing with the Germans. The Americans knew that the Germans were characterless adventurers, but the Indians did not. If my information is correct no words can measure the depths of infamy to which the Germans can sink. They must be shunned as utterly unsociable and immoral bipeds. It is to be hoped that these young Indian enthusiasts will also give up the fruitless revolutionary methods which have made them the dupes of cunning German imperialists during this war.

The Orient has learned that it made a bad bargain when it accepted the German alliance. A leading Turkish newspaper recently wrote: "We do not like the Germans. And the Germans themselves are to blame for this." These words sum up the

judgment of the Turks on their allies. The Germans have had a great chance, but they have lost it, because they are morally unfit for such great tasks. This is the lesson of the four years' work in common. The German inroad into Asia will remain in the memory of Oriental nations as a troubled dream. Now they must be awaked to the sober reality, which teaches them that their destiny is linked with that of the English people for a very long time to come.

CONCLUSION

EVERY tale must have a moral. And my garrulous war notes are also intended to emphasise certain truths which have been brought home to us during the war. No thinking man can remain the same after this war as he was before it. As Lowell says, "New occasions teach new duties."

We must now learn that England has a moral and historical mission in Asia. The English people have built up an empire in Asia and Africa during the last two hundred years. They had previously prepared themselves for this task by establishing free institutions at home and developing a great and noble literature. This empire has its roots deep in the historical forces and movements of the past. It is not a mushroom growth. It is not based on the quicksands of mere ambition and exploitation. It has shown itself to be a solid structure founded on the rock of historical necessity and

British wisdom. The Germans counted upon a revolt in Ireland and South Africa, a general insurrection of all the Muslims, and a rebellion in India. They also hoped that some Allies would desert the *Entente*. None of these hopes have been fulfilled. Irish "Nationalism," the great Jihād, and Indian and Egyptian "extremism" have been found to be puny forces compared with British imperialism. England has also managed to keep her Allies together in spite of the reverses and vicissitudes of the military struggle during four years. A nation's character and wisdom are put to the test in such crises. Germany has been weighed in the balance and found wanting. Great Britain has vindicated her title to her vast empire. The English colonies have loyally responded to the call of the Mother Country; the Asiatic colonies have rendered assistance, or created no difficulties at such a perilous time. The Boers have stood faithfully by England. A nation that can save such an empire in the face of various and enormous difficulties must be recognised as the trustee of the future of Asia and Africa.

British character and British statesmanship will preserve this heritage for a long time, and the storms of jealousy and intrigue will beat against it in vain. The British Empire is an institution that has come to stay. In this respect it resembles the ancient Roman Empire and the Spanish Empire in America. We can have our different plans and programmes for the development of this empire ; but the institution will remain a single political unit during several centuries. It will of course undergo a process of evolution in the right direction, for progress is the law of life for all organisations. The stability of the British Empire is a salient fact that emerges from the dust and smoke of the war.

We have also learned that the dissolution of the British and the French Empires in Asia and Africa would result only in a change of masters for the people of those regions. The Germans wished to acquire the French colonies and the territory of the Ottoman Empire. The world is a battlefield for the powerful imperialists of all nations ; and the weak and disorganised Oriental nations

are only the pawns in the game. They cannot establish or maintain free national States in this era of armed imperialism. They must live and die as friends and *protégés* of the great Powers. Under these circumstances, English and French imperialism is a thousand times preferable to German or Japanese imperialism. The English and the French have free institutions at home ; and they are morally the most advanced of all the great nations of the world. The peoples of Asia and Africa must make common cause with these two nations, and try to assimilate their culture and ideals. In course of time they will be admitted as equal citizens of these States. Intrigue with the enemies of England and France will lead only to disaster. If the other nations, which may set up as rivals of England and France, succeed in their aims, they will rule over us, and our last state will be worse than the first. If they fail they will betray us, and we shall suffer. In either case, the will-o'-the-wisp of intransigent " nationalism " and race-hatred would land us in the bogs of misery and misfortune.

The Ukrainians intrigued with the Germans in order to "free" themselves from Russian "tyranny"; but they found that the Germans were worse masters than the Russians. They repented bitterly of their folly when they began to perceive the ruinous effects of their policy. The Turks refused to come to terms with England and France, and to-day they curse the Germans. Experience teaches us that the feeble peoples should work with the great nations which have already organised the vast empires in Asia and Africa. Disruption can only expose them to much greater evils than those from which they suffer under the present system. Co-operation and evolution should be our watchwords. The policy of separation and intrigue is futile and fallacious.

The Muslims of India and Egypt should lay aside their religious bigotry and work with the English and the French for the acquisition of modern citizenship. Religion is a private affair in the modern world. The Jihād has been found to be a vain cry. The mountain of Islamic fanaticism has brought

forth the little mouse of local riots and tumults. The Caliphate is in liquidation. The Muslims should learn that London and Paris are the centres of world-politics to-day. They should give up the dreams of Pan-Islamism, and set to work as loyal British and French citizens to raise themselves to the level of European civilisation. They should let the dead past bury its dead, and prepare themselves for the glorious tasks that await them in the States to which they now belong.

East and West must unite for the realisation of these new ideals. The English and the French must get rid of race-prejudice and pride. The Orientals must lay aside distrust and rancour. The two languages in which the message of freedom was first delivered to the modern world should be studied and loved in Asia and Africa. English and French will serve to unite the Orient and the Occident in indissoluble bonds of comradeship. For us, Indians and Egyptians, English literature should be a treasure of untold worth. English history should be a mine of the noblest wisdom for

us and our children. England has much to give us besides protection and organisation. We are now heirs to all that the Englishman holds in fee as his birthright. England is free and great, and we can share in this freedom and greatness as worthy citizens of the greatest State that the world has yet seen. England will achieve what Alexander dreamed of and what Rome partially accomplished. We, too, are called to this work. If we help to realise this ideal, generations yet unborn will bless our names. The future keeps its secret, but we must do our duty in this spirit, looking forward to the advent of the time—

“ When the war-drum throbs no longer, and the
battle-flag is furled
In the Parliament of Man, the Federation of the
World.”

FINIS.

KING'S NEW BOOKS

WAR FINANCE.

By J. SHIELD NICHOLSON, M.A., Sc.D., LL.D., Professor of Political Economy in the University of Edinburgh. Second Edition, with three additional Chapters. 12s. 6d. net. Inland Postage, 6d.

Scotsman: "‘Currency and inflation, prices and profits,’ extravagance in public and private expenditure, borrowing and taxation, are the principal subjects discussed in the volume . . . of permanent value as a contemporary record and criticism of war finance under unprecedented conditions. . . . Many of the earlier judgments have already been justified by the course of events."

THE FUTURE OF THE KANAKA.

By EDWARD JACOMB, Author of "France and England in the New Hebrides." Crown 8vo. Cloth, 6s. net. Inland Postage, 6d.

CONTENTS:—Introduction. Part I.—The Future of the Pacific. II.—Government. III.—Missions. IV.—The Future of the Kanaka.

THE MAKING OF AMERICA

A BOOK FOR BRITONS.

By F. C. DE SUMICHRIST, Associate Professor Emeritus, Harvard University. Crown 8vo. Cloth, 6s. net. Inland Postage, 4d.

Edinburgh Evening Dispatch: "... shows in a bright, crisp and popular way how the United States came to be, and why its political principles are as they are. . . . It is not a history; it is rather a comprehensive sketch of the story of America, and what is more important still, of the growth of the principles on which American policy is moulded."

The Observer: "Mr. Sumichrast's book will contribute to the establishment of a better understanding on both sides of the water, of such events as the American Revolution, and the Civil War."

Lists of Messrs. King's publications on—Reconstruction, Peace and War, Fiscal Question, Health, Land, Finance, Women's Questions, Poor Law, Local Government, Labour, Railways, Transport, and Subject Catalogue of Publications on Economics, Politics, and Sociology, will be sent, post free, on application.

P. S. KING & SON, Ltd., 2 & 4, Gt. Smith St., Westminster



00086245

Digitized with financial assistance from
Shri Brihad Bhartiya Samaj
on 20 February, 2020

